

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated August 26, 2003.

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 27-29 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 - 26 remain pending in the present application. Claims 17 - 26 were previously withdrawn from consideration. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

Examiner's Interview

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's cooperation at the Examiner's Interview on February 5, 2004. The Applicants look forward to the Examiner's further consideration of the comments and explanations provided during the Examiner's Interview, as summarized below.

Mihara

With regard to **Mihara**, column 11, lines 11-20 of **Mihara** only describe the determination of the interval of P pictures based on the interval of the I pictures and other information from the encoders and decoders of the video data processing system. The Examiner apparently understands that **Mihara** does not teach or suggest deciding the P frame interval ... "based on *motion* features between timewise adjacent frames with respect to the input video pictures" wherein such motion features pertain to timewise adjacent P frames of the input video pictures (not I frames or other data from the encoders and decoders described in **Mihara**).

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to clarify this distinction over the prior art, independent claims 2 and 3 were amended to recite "motion features between timewise adjacent

P frames with respect to the input video pictures” which clearly *exclude* data related to I pictures and other information from the encoders and decoders of the video data processing system as disclosed at column 11, lines 11-20 of **Mihara**. Therefore, the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art rejections based on **Mihara**.

On a separate issue, the Examiner asked about the term “one-way” in the claims. As pointed out by the Examiner, this term would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art to be directional, for example, like “forward” or “backward” motion vectors.

Kato

The Examiner acknowledged that **Kato** does not describe a P frame interval inside of the GOP being decided based on the decision by the P frame interval means. Of course, the Examiner made the further reference to **Guede** for this missing feature. For instance, the Examiner pointed to Figure 3 of **Guede** which discloses the use of P frames between two different GOPs (e.g., between GOP 2 and GOP 3). However, such disclosures of **Guede** still do not teach or suggest the P frame interval inside *one* GOP being decided based on the decision by the P frame interval means.

In accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion to clarify this distinction over the prior art, independent claims 2 and 3 were amended to clarify that the P frame interval is “inside one GOP.” Therefore, the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art rejections based on **Kato** and **Guede**, either alone or in combination.

Application No.: 09/515,896

Response Under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 dated February 26, 2004

Reply to the Office Action dated August 26, 2003

Igarashi

With regard to the further reference to **Igarashi**, claims 14-16 distinguish over the prior art for the reasons that their base claim(s) distinguish over **Kato** and **Guede**, as discussed above.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully Submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



John P. Kong
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 40,054

JPK:kal
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-1100
Q:\2000\000233\Filings\1.114 Response - February 2004.doc